



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/725,154	12/01/2003	Walt Singleton	2002P19675 US01	1773

7590 10/05/2006

Alexander J. Burke
Intellectual Property Department
5th Floor
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

BOTTS, MICHAEL K

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/725,154	Applicant(s) SINGLETON ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael K. Botts	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 April 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This document is a Final Office Action on the merits. This action is responsive to the following communications: Amendment, which was filed on April 12, 2006.
2. Claims 1-17 are currently pending in the case, with claims 1, 13, 14, and 15 being the independent claims.
3. The drawings were objected to. Applicant has appropriately changed to drawings. Accordingly, the objection is withdrawn.
4. A limitation on priority was noted in the Non-Final Office Action filed January 12, 2006. Applicant has identified bases in the Provisional Application supporting the cited limitations. Accordingly, the limitations on Priority are withdrawn,
5. Claims 1-17 are rejected.

The Specification

6. Applicant is reminded of the continuing requirement to update the status (pending, allowed, etc.) of all parent priority applications in the first line of the specification. The status of all citations of U.S. filed applications in the specification should also be updated where appropriate.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The newly added limitation of a "text processing application compatible" document template is new matter, not found to have been taught or disclosed in the specification.

8. In the interest of compact prosecution, the application is further examined against the prior art, as stated below, upon the assumption that the applicants may overcome the above stated rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Claims Rejection – 35 U.S.C. 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marchal, B., "Applied XML Solutions, The Authoritative Solution," Sam's, 2000, [hereinafter "Marchal"], and further in view of Muench, S., "Building Oracle XML Applications," O'Reilly & Associates, 2000, [hereinafter "Muench"].

Regarding **independent claim 1**, Marchal in view of Muench teaches:

A document generation system for producing a document from information derived from an information repository, comprising:

a source of code representing a document template including, data fields containing placeholder items to be replaced by desired data items, and also including a repetition identifier indicating one of said data fields is to be replicated to provide a group of data fields to be replaced by a plurality of said desired data items;

a source of document generation control information supporting insertion of said desired data items derived from said information repository in said data fields; and

a document processor for applying said control information in replacing template document data field placeholder items with desired data items, to produce a generated document.

(See, See, Marchal, pages 71-102, particularly figures 3.8 and 3.11, teaching a document template with placeholders in data fields to be replaced with desired data items. The source code for figure 3.8 is taught in listing 3.4, Marchal pages 82-84. The source code for figure 3.11 is taught in listing 3.5, Marchal pages 89-93.

Marchal also teaches a source of document generation control information supporting insertion of the desired data items from an information repository. See, Marchal, pages 71-102, particularly pages 73-84, teaching code to generate insertion of

desired data into data fields. Marchal also teaches a document processor for applying the control information in replacing template document data field placeholder items with desired data items to produce a generated document. See, Marchal, pages 71-102, particularly pages 73-84, teaching code to generate insertion of desired data into data fields. See also, Marchal, figure 7.8 and pages 209-214.

Marchal does not explicitly teach a repetition identifier indicating data fields to be replicated to provide a group of data fields to be replaced by a plurality of said desired data items.

Muench teaches identification, control, and rendering data fields with duplicate or repetitious data. See, Muench, pages 375-387, teaching sorting a grouping repeating data, and pages 433-499, particularly pages 470-475, teaching managing and display of repeating data fields.

Marchal and Muench are in the same field of endeavor, creating and manipulating electronic forms creation and data insertion into electronic forms.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Marchal and Muench.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Marchal and Muench to create a form template that handles repeating data items for the obvious and beneficial purpose of expanding a form template such that it handles repeating data. The function of repeating data of Muench is merely an add-on enhancement to the basic teachings of the form template of Marchal.)

Regarding **dependent claim 2**, Marchal in view of Muench teach:

*The system according to claim 1, wherein
said control information contains at least one of, (a) an identification of
data fields in said template document available to be replaced by desired data
items, (b) an identification of a location in said information repository of a desired
data item associated with an individual data field, and (c) an identification of a
location in said information repository of a first data item for insertion in said
individual data field of said group of data fields and data items sequentially linked
to said first data item are inserted in remaining data fields of said group of data
fields.*

(See, Marchal, pages 71-102, and see also, figures 7.7 and 7.8, and pages 208-214,
teaching the identification of data fields in the template document available to be
replaced by desired data items.)

Regarding **dependent claim 3**, Marchal in view of Muench teach:

*The system according to claim 2, wherein
said location identifier of said first data item comprises an Extensible
Markup Language compatible XPath value.*

(See, Marchal, pages 330-336, particularly 333-336, teaching the use of XPath to select
elements in a source XML document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 4, as amended**, Marchal in view of Muench teach:

The system according to claim 1, including a data source file associating data field names of said document template with a data location in an information repository, said data source file comprising at least one of, (a) a comma delimited file and (b) a flat file.

(See, Marchal, pages 165-194, teaching tokenizing input files, which parses comma delimited and flat files.)

Regarding **dependent claim 5**, Marchal in view of Muench teach:

*The system according to claim 1, wherein
said repetition identifier comprises a Rich Text Format (RTF) compatible
Bookmark.*

(See, Marchal, pages 129-166, teaching conversion of XML document to RTF, inherently including conversion of XML bookmarks and repetition identifiers to RTF.)

Regarding **dependent claim 6, as amended**, Marchal in view of Muench teach:

*The system according to claim 1, wherein
said code representing said document template is at least one of, (a) word
processing application compatible and (b) Rich Text Format (RTF) compatible.*

(See, Marchal, pages 129-166, teaching conversion of XML document to RTF.)

Regarding **dependent claim 7**, Marchal in view of Muench teach:

*The system according to claim 1, wherein
said document processor processes template document data, excluding
said desired data items inserted in said placeholder items, by incorporating said
template document data in said generated document and said generated
document is compatible with Extensible Stylesheet Language (XSL).*

(See, Marchal, pages 329-333 teaching XSL attributes in XML templates. See also, Marchal, pages 122-123, teaching use of XSL style sheets with an XML document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 8**, Marchal in view of Muench teach:

*The system according to claim 1, wherein
said generated document comprises one or more of, (a) an SGML
document, (b) an XML document, (c) an HTML document, and (d) a multimedia
file.*

(See, Marchal, pages 103-127, teaching generation of the document in SGML, XML, and HTML.)

Regarding **dependent claim 9**, Marchal in view of Muench teach:

*The system according to claim 1, wherein
said desired data items derived from said information repository are
Extensible Markup Language (XML) compatible data items derived from an XML
compatible document.*

Art Unit: 2176

(See, Marchal, page 168, and pages 329-336, teaching import of XML files through an XSLT processor.)

Regarding **dependent claim 10**, Marchal in view of Muench teach:

*The system according to claim 1, wherein
said document processor processes template document data in Rich Text
Format (RTF) together with desired data items derived from said information
repository in Extensible Markup Language (XML) to provide said generated
document in an Extensible Stylesheet Language (XSL) format.*

(See, Marchal, pages 129-166, teaching XML and RTF file. See, also Marchal, pages 103-127, and 329-226 teaching generation of the document in XSL format.)

Regarding **dependent claim 11**, Marchal in view of Muench teach:

*The system according to claim 10, wherein
said document processor includes an XML parser to process said
generated document in Extensible Stylesheet Language (XSL) format to provide
a processed document in Rich Text Format (RTF).*

(See, Marchal, pages 168-194, teaching XML parsers. See also, Marchal, pages 129-166, and particularly 144-145, teaching XML document to RTF generation using XSL.)

Regarding **dependent claim 12**, Marchal in view of Muench teach:

The system according to claim 1, wherein

said document processor examines said document template to identify an individual data field containing a placeholder item and incorporate a link in said individual data field identifying a corresponding item in said document generation control information, said corresponding item enabling locating one of said desired data items in said information repository for insertion in said individual data field.

(See, Marchal, pages 71-102, teaching links from information repositories to data fields containing placeholder items in a form template.)

Regarding independent claim 13, as amended:

Claim 13 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale. The image generator is implicitly shown by the images generated and taught in Marchal, figures 3.7-3.13, and page 71-102.

Regarding independent claim 14, as amended:

Claim 14 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 15, as amended:

Claim 15 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding **independent claim 16**:

Claim 16 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 7 and, in further consideration of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

It is noted that the term "merging" is not found to be defined or discussed in the specification. The Examiner believes the Applicants intended the term to be defined as was understood by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, as follows: "To combine two or more items, such as list, in an ordered way and without changing the basic structure of either." See, "Microsoft Computer Dictionary," fifth edition, Microsoft Press, 2002, definition of "merge."

Merging parts of XSL compatible code is inherent in the use of XSL compatible code.

Regarding **dependent claim 17, as amended**, Marchal in view of Muench teach:

A method for producing a document according to claim 15, further comprising the steps of:

receiving a selection of the electronic document template; and

receiving a selection of a source of the data items.

(See, Muench, pages 288-309, teaching creation and uses of multiple electronic document templates. See, Muench, pages 284-288, teaching multiple source data inputs.)

It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See, MPEP 2123.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed April 12, 2006 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Regarding rejections of independent claim 1:

FIRST: Applicants argue that the references "fail to show or suggest a source code representing a document template including, data fields containing placeholder items to be replaced by desired data items, and also including a repetition identifier indicating one of said data fields is to be replicated to provide a group of data fields to be replaced by a plurality of said desired data items." See, Remarks, page 7.

The Examiner disagrees.

See, Marchal, pages 71-102, particularly figures 3.8 and 3.11, teaching a document template with placeholders in data fields to be replaced with desired data items. The source code for figure 3.8 is taught in listing 3.4, Marchal pages 82-84. The source code for figure 3.11 is taught in listing 3.5, Marchal pages 89-93.

Marchal and Muench are in the same field of endeavor, creating and manipulating electronic forms creation and data insertion into electronic forms.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Marchal and Muench.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Marchal and Muench to create a form template that handles repeating data items for the obvious and beneficial purpose of expanding a form template such that it handles repeating data. The function of repeating data of Muench is merely an add-on enhancement to the basic teachings of the form template of Marchal.

SECOND: Applicants argue that the references fail to show or suggest a "document generation control information in said data fields and a document processor for applying said control information in replacing template document data field placeholder items with desired data items to produce a generated document." See, Remarks, page 8.

The Examiner disagrees.

Marchal also teaches a source of document generation control information supporting insertion of the desired data items from an information repository. See, Marchal, pages 71-102, particularly pages 73-84, teaching code to generate insertion of desired data into data fields. Marchal also teaches a document processor for applying the control information in replacing template document data field placeholder items with desired data items to produce a generated document. See, Marchal, pages 71-102,

particularly pages 73-84, teaching code to generate insertion of desired data into data fields. See also, Marchal, figure 7.8 and pages 209-214.

Marchal does not explicitly teach a repetition identifier indicating data fields to be replicated to provide a group of data fields to be replaced by a plurality of said desired data items.

Muench teaches identification, control, and rendering data fields with duplicate or repetitious data. See, Muench, pages 375-387, teaching sorting a grouping repeating data, and pages 433-499, particularly pages 470-475, teaching managing and display of repeating data fields.

Marchal and Muench are in the same field of endeavor, creating and manipulating electronic forms creation and data insertion into electronic forms.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Marchal and Muench.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Marchal and Muench to create a form template that handles repeating data items for the obvious and beneficial purpose of expanding a form template such that it handles repeating data. The function of repeating data of Muench is merely an add-on enhancement to the basic teachings of the form template of Marchal.

Regarding rejections of dependent claim 2:

Applicants argue that the references fail to show or suggest a “repetition identifier.” See, Remarks, page 10.

The Examiner disagrees.

Code for a repetition identifier is clearly taught in Marchal, pages 71-102, and see also, figures 7.7 and 7.8, and pages 208-214, teaching the identification of data fields in the template document available to be replaced by desired data items.

Regarding rejections of dependent claim 3:

Applicants argue that the references fail to show or suggest a “location identifier” in XPath. See, Remarks, page 10

The Examiner disagrees.

See, Marchal, pages 330-336, particularly 333-336, teaching the use of XPath to select elements in a source XML document.

Regarding rejections of dependent claim 4:

Applicants argue that the references fail to show or suggest the elements of claim 4. Applicant further argues that Marchal “nowhere shows or suggests such features.” See, Remarks, page 10.

The Examiner disagrees.

See, Marchal, pages 165-194, teaching tokenizing input files, which parses comma delimited and flat files.

Regarding rejections of dependent claim 5:

Applicants argue that the references fail to show or suggest "conversion of an XML bookmark to RTF. See, Remarks, page 11.

The Examiner disagrees.

See, Marchal, pages 129-166, teaching conversion of XML document to RTF, inherently including conversion of XML bookmarks and repetition identifiers to RTF.

Regarding rejections of dependent claim 6:

Applicants argue that the references fail to show or suggest the elements of claim 6, such that "the claimed arrangement advantageously enables use of word processing application of RTF compatible document templates understandable by non-programmers in creation of a customized form by a non-programmer user." See, Remarks, page 11.

The Examiner disagrees.

The requirement of understandability by non-programmers is not claimed. The elements of the claim are taught or suggested as cited in the rejection above.

Regarding rejections of dependent claim 7:

Applicants argue that the references fail to show or suggest the elements of claim 7. See, Remarks, pages 11-12.

The Examiner disagrees.

The generation of the template document compatible with XSL is fully taught in the references. See, Marchal, pages 329-333 teaching XSL attributes in XML templates. See also, Marchal, pages 122-123, teaching use of XSL style sheets with an XML document.

Regarding rejections of dependent claim 10:

Applicants argue that the references fail to show or suggest the elements of claim 10. See, Remarks, page 12.

The Examiner disagrees.

The generation of the template document in RTF and compatible with XSL is fully taught in the references. See, Marchal, pages 129-166, teaching XML and RTF files. See, also Marchal, pages 103-127, and 329-226 teaching generation of the document in XSL format.

Regarding rejections of dependent claim 11:

Applicants argue that the references fail to show or suggest an XML parser to process said generated document in XSL format to provide a processed document in RTF format." See, Remarks, pages 12-13.

The Examiner disagrees.

See, Marchal, pages 168-194, teaching XML parsers. See also, Marchal, pages 129-166, and particularly 144-145, teaching XML document to RTF generation using XSL.

Regarding rejections of dependent claim 12:

Applicants argue that the references fail to show or suggest the limitations of claim 12. Applicant's argue further that there is no suggestion in the references to combine the teachings of the references. See, Remarks, page 13.

The Examiner disagrees.

Marchal, at pages 71-102, teaches links from information repositories to data fields containing placeholder items in a form template.

Marchal and Muench are in the same field of endeavor, creating and manipulating electronic forms creation and data insertion into electronic forms.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Marchal and Muench.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Marchal and Muench to create a form template that handles repeating data items for the obvious and beneficial purpose of expanding a form template such that it handles repeating data. The function of repeating data of Muench is merely an add-on enhancement to the basic teachings of the form template of Marchal.

Regarding rejections of independent claim 13:

FIRST: Applicants argue that the claim is patentable for the reasons stated earlier in arguments in support of patentability of claims 1 and 6.

The Examiner disagrees.

The elements of the claim are taught or suggested as cited in the rejection above.

SECOND: Applicants argue that the references fail to show or suggest “an image element enabling User selection of a text processing application compatible document template.” It is noted that the limitation of a “text processing application compatible” document template was recently added by amendment. See, Remarks, pages 13-14.

The Examiner disagrees.

The image generator is implicitly shown by the images generated and taught in Marchal, figures 3.7-3.13, and page 71-102.

The limitation of a “text processing application compatible” document template is new matter.

Regarding rejections of dependent claim 14:

Applicants argue that the claim is patentable for the reasons stated earlier in arguments in support of patentability of claims 1, 6, and 13.

The Examiner disagrees.

The elements of the claim are taught or suggested as cited in the rejection above.

Regarding rejections of dependent claim 15:

Applicants argue that the claim is patentable for the reasons stated earlier in arguments in support of patentability of claims 1, 6, and 13.

The Examiner disagrees.

The elements of the claim are taught or suggested as cited in the rejection above.

Regarding rejections of dependent claim 16:

Applicants argue that the references fail to show or suggest a system in which the "step of merging is performed by at least one of (a) XSL compatible code and (b) a mail merge application program." See, Remarks, page 15.

The Examiner disagrees.

It is noted that the term "merging" is not found to be defined or discussed in the specification. The Examiner believes the Applicants intended the term to be defined as was understood by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, as follows: "To combine two or more items, such as list, in an ordered way and without changing the basic structure of either." See, "Microsoft Computer Dictionary," fifth edition, Microsoft Press, 2002, definition of "merge."

Merging parts of XSL compatible code is inherent in the use of XSL compatible code.

Regarding rejections of dependent claim 17:

Applicants argue that the references fail to show or suggest a system involving "receiving a selection of text processing application compatible electronic document templates and receiving a selection of a source of the data items."

The Examiner disagrees.

Claim 17 claims a method, not a system. Assuming that Applicants intended to argue the method, it is noted as follows: Muench, pages 288-309, teaches creation and uses of multiple electronic document templates. See also, Muench, pages 284-288, teaching multiple source data inputs. This teaches a selection of text processing application compatible electronic document templates and a selection of a source of the data items.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** for the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael K. Botts whose telephone number is 571-272-5533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00-4:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MKB/mkb


Heather R. Herndon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100